

**VETERANS AND SENIORS COMMITTEE
of the
SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE**

Minutes

A regular meeting of the Veterans and Seniors Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York, on **November 21, 2002**.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Legislator William J. Lindsay - Chairman
Legislator Cameron Alden
Legislator Andrew A. Crecca
Legislator Lynne C. Nowick

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Legislator Martin W. Haley - Excused absence

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Terrence Pearsall - Aide to Legislator Lindsay
Ed Hogan - Aide to Legislator Nowick
Art Lozeau - Director, Veterans Service Agency
Holly Rhodes-Teague - Director, Office of the Aging
Sean Clancy - Budget Review Office
Robert Lipp - Budget Review Office
Nicole DeAngelo - County Executive's Office, Budget
Maureen Porta - Suffolk County Office for the Aging
Other Interested Parties

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Ana Grande- Court Stenographer

1

(THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 10:43 A.M.)

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

Could we call the Veterans & Seniors Committee to order. Could we stand for the pledge. Legislator Alden, please lead us in the pledge.

(SALUTATION)

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

Okay. Does anybody want to address us? Holly, do you have anything for us?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Do you want to talk now about the resolutions or do you want to talk --

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

Yeah.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Okay. Good morning. Is this on?

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

No, I don't think so. No, the top, right there.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Hello. I know on the agenda today we have six resolutions, and a little bit of background on the six resolutions. Suffolk County, you know, as Maureen has pointed out to me many times, we've hit the lottery for some reason. We have a thirteen percent increase in population from 1990 to 2000. So, we went from a hundred and ninety-eight thousand people over the age of sixty to two hundred and twenty-four thousand.

So, that thirteen percent increase in population, while we've increased by I think it came out to twenty-six thousand seniors, New York City lost twenty-five thousand seniors, and we had the highest actual amount of people over the age of sixty increase in New York State.

So, when they were reallocating funds on the state level, we -- we're getting more money.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

We weren't going to have this meeting today, because we just met last week and we didn't figure there would be anything on the agenda, but then when they told me we have to meet to accept money, that's always a good reason to call a meeting.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

It's good for us too. So, I just wanted to give you some background on this. On the over seventy-five population, we've had a twenty-eight percent increase since 1990, and the over eighty-five population, which is the fastest growing population in the census data all over the place, is a forty percent increase.

And the over eighty-five is the frailest of the frail and the over seventy-five usually need services as well. So, our office over the next few years, we're going to be really busy, so the extra money that we're bringing in is great, you know, we need it.

Overall, with the six resolutions, we're talking about five hundred and fifty-two thousand dollars. The way the resolutions -- none of the resolutions are requiring any actual new dollars from Suffolk County. We're either using, match from our contractors or we're using funds, we're using indirect costs that are in the operating budget already or we have found over match from another one of our programs or we have used match from the transit system, we're able to use.

So, we're asking for this money to be accepted without increasing another dollar from Suffolk County's budget.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:
We can do that, right?

LEG. NOWICK:
I don't know.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:
No, we're taking it from some place else besides --

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:
Cameron is very leery.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:
Why, you don't believe me?

LEG. CRECCA:
It sounds a little too fiscally responsible.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:
You know, the indirect costs on one of the programs, you know, we'll take it, we can use the indirect costs, such as rent, you know, so we say to the State, listen, this is what our rent would be if we were paying rent, and that's being used.

The Suffolk Transit, you know, the difference between what a senior pays and what the regular fare is, that subsidy is used as match for some of our programs. The contractors on some of the resolutions, they're paying part of the match into it. So, we're trying real hard to do these programs.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:
Is any of this new types of grants or is it just as a result of population, existing programs that we've already --

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:
The newest program, which has been in now for a year and a half, about a year and a half, is the III-E, the Caregiver Support Program. That one we're still getting off the ground, but that would be our newest

program. All the other programs, the C-2 is home delivered, that's been around forever. The Islip Expanded In-home Services to the

3

Elderly Program, that's been around for a long time. So, it's really, it's all money that has been in for the last year and a half, but some of them forever.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

Now, you just said the increase was five hundred thousand dollars?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

What we're asking to bring into the budget.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

Okay.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Under the C-2 Program, which is the home delivery meal program, some of the money in that is money that was in other areas of our Title III money that we're bringing over to the C-2 to do shelf stable meals. It's money that we didn't use elsewhere that we're going to use there, because we have a need for it.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

But here's my question, Holly, how much do we bring in total into your department from either the State or federal government?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

This is a trick question.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

No.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Prior to Epic, last year when I did my budget, I used to say that my budget was eighty-five percent funded, eighty three percent funded, depending on what year it was, between eighty-three, eighty-four, eighty-five percent funded through State or federal programs. It's not quite that much now, because Epic has brought in more County funds, so I don't really know what my total is in terms of funding from the State or federal.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

But you don't know in terms of dollars -- do you know in terms of dollars, roughly?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Maureen knows.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

Okay.

MS. PORTA:

Eight million.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Okay. I have to put my glasses on, hold on a second. All right. Let me find the number. Oh, okay. It's eight million dollars. Wait a second, yeah, eight million out of total fourteen million? Out of

4

fourteen million.

MS. PORTA:

And three million of that is Epic.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Right.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

Would we be able to capture that money if we didn't have a separate department for the aging?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

I believe the legislation, the way it's written, you have to have an area agency out of Aging in order to bring the funds in and then we distribute that. We are the designated area agency on aging.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

So if we didn't have a Department of Aging, we wouldn't be able to get the money?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

If would be difficult to do that.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

It's good for us to know, especially what we just went through with the budget, you know, there was all kinds of things floated about merging different departments and eliminating departments and stuff. And that was the point I was trying to make and I think it's important for the Committee to know that.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Under the Federal Older Americans Act, you have to be the designated area agency on aging in order to receive funds under the federal, you know, federal money. And I think the State has restrictions on how the money gets designated out as well.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:
Cameron.

LEG. ALDEN:
This money is for '02 or '03?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:
The money is coming in now, it will be brought into the '03 budget as well. You know, it will roll over so we can continue. Some of the money goes to March 31st.

LEG. ALDEN:
I have a question for Budget Review. Does this violate the cap laws or is it going to put us -- push up against it or is it off budget?

MR. CLANCY:
To be honest with you, I don't really know the answer to that right now. I can check on that and get back to you.

5

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:
How would it violate the cap laws?

LEG. ALDEN:
We have caps on spending, you know, you can only go to a certain level. I think it's, Andrew would probably know better than I would, four percent, Mr. Chairman of Finance?

LEG. CRECCA:
Four percent, yes.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:
I think we've increased -- we've brought money in every year. At other times of the year I've never had a problem with it, but I don't know.

LEG. ALDEN:
So you're going to get back to us?

MR. CLANCY:
I can get that information for you. I just at this time I don't have it.

LEG. CRECCA:
Is it in the budget now, this money?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:
The money that I'm asking to bring in today is not in the budget,

that's why I'm here. If it was already there, I couldn't do it. This is money that, you know, mid-year we get, they give me the notice of grant awards from the State telling me this is the additional funds we're receiving. So this is over and above what's in the '02 budget and then we'll be over and above what's in the '03 budget, because we didn't know about it beforehand.

LEG. ALDEN:

And Budget Review is going to get an answer on the cap laws?

MR. CLANCY:

Yes. I don't have it right now, but I will get it.

LEG. CRECCA:

That's fine.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

Even if it did, I mean we'd have to find some way to take the money, right? You don't want to turn down a half million dollars.

LEG. CRECCA:

Yeah. I guess Cameron's concern I think is not taking the money, he has a legitimate point in the sense that we've got to be concerned that, A, it doesn't exceed the cap laws, but I think this is going to come in -- it sounds like it's going to come into 2002's operating budget and then it will become part of the surplus.

6

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

But it will also be rolled over by the '03 budget.

LEG. CRECCA:

Right.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Bill, I just wanted to clarify, the five hundred and fifty-two thousand, that's all the money we're asking to bring in, but some of that money again was money that was in other parts of the Title III that are going over, so it's not all brand new, it's just something coming over, but a substantial amount of it is, it's only the C-2 that, you know, was in other portions.

We are asking out of this, out of these programs under the Expanded In-Home services to the Elderly, we're asking for four positions, because in order to do more home care, I need more caseworkers. So we're asking for two caseworker trainees, because we can't open a case unless we have a caseworker to do it.

And we're also asking to put -- to expand the home care and we're also

asking for two support staff to work on these programs as well.

LEG. CRECCA:
For this year?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:
Excuse me?

LEG. CRECCA:
For '02?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:
Well, they're in here, the money would roll over and we'd hire three -- I mean the chances of me hiring in December is nil.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:
But that's -- I mean the positions are already there, you're not creating new positions, we just need them filled?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:
No. I'm creating new positions with this funding.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:
And the funding will pay for the positions?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:
Yes. It's four positions. Two caseworker trainees, a clerk typist and a contracts technician.

LEG. CRECCA:
That resolution hasn't been drafted yet, has it?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:
It's in here. It's not creating a new title. Once it's in here, then it would go into the budget, right, isn't that how it works?

7

LEG. CRECCA:
If it's creating a new title?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:
It's not a new title.

LEG. CRECCA:
It's an existing title?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:
It's an existing title, but it's a new position.

LEG. CRECCA:

You mean you're filling an existing title?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Once this gets approved by the Legislature, the money is then into the budget where I can then higher. Isn't that the way it works?

LEG. CRECCA:

If it's a position that's existing in the budget already, it doesn't have to be approved by the Legislature.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

But these are new positions, but you're approving it as part of this.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

Well, if that's the case then, we're going to need a resolution from the County Exec's Office on it.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

The positions are in the one resolution.

LEG. CRECCA:

Can we get Counsel to the horseshoe, please? Just to make sure we're doing it right.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

I don't think we've had a problem with this before.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

I don't see a problem with it, it's just a matter of --

LEG. NOWICK:

But the positions that you're filling, you're filling them for the 2003?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

They'd be going in now, they would create the positions and then they'd be created in the budget and then they would roll over into the next year's budget.

LEG. NOWICK:

The money that you're getting, you're using for the positions?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:

How does that work for the years after that?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

This money is expected to be continuing.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

It's based on population.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

The population increase in funds that I have.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

The only way it would be reduced is if our population for the elderly starts --

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

And that won't happen until 2010.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

And of all the resolutions I have before us today, it's all accepting and appropriating additional funds.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Right.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

I don't see a specific resolution to create positions.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Well, it's there, but in the one resolution it has the four positions listed. The second one, ISEP, 2219-0202. If you look how we're going to use the funding, the following position to be created for Suffolk County Exec's budget for Office of Aging as follows. Do you have that bill?

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

Yes. I have it.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Okay.

LEG. NOWICK:

What's the number?

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

2200. It's on the follow-up sheet. It's on page 681, it says 681. We'll get an answer to both the cap and whether we need another resolution or will this suffice.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Okay. I think we've done it this way before, though.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

Okay.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Anybody have any questions for me?

LEG. NOWICK:

Holly, while we're doing that, while we're waiting for an answer, if you wouldn't mind?

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

Go ahead.

LEG. NOWICK:

I was very interested in the amount of seniors that are, the rising amount of seniors and the good news is I figured if they're over eighty-five, I got a good another thirty years I think, I'm okay.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Eighty-five -- over eighty-five is the fastest growing segment of the population.

LEG. NOWICK:

Do you have that broken down by towns, the increase?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

I don't know if we have that. Does it have the over eighty? Hold on a second.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

Holly, it's odd that you said that the over eighty-five population needs so much more care.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

At 8:30 this morning I had to take my eighty-seven year old father-in-law to the doctor, you know.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

You're a caregiver.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

Yes.

MS. PORTA:

We have the total, not the increase, but we can get the increase.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Lynne, we have the population, percentage of the County senior population in each town, but I don't have it broken out by eighty-five or seventy-five.

LEG. NOWICK:

But you have at each town?

10

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

So over sixty, like you're in Smithtown, you have 9.45 percent of the senior population over sixty.

LEG. NOWICK:

Wait, wait.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Percentage of seniors --

LEG. NOWICK:

Do you call senior population over sixty?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

I know, isn't that sad? That's what we use.

LEG. NOWICK:

Thank God I'm not in that. What is it, 9.4?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

You have 9.45 percent of the County senior population and then in your geographic area the percentage of people over the age of sixty is 18.35 percent.

LEG. NOWICK:

Within the Smithtown area?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Right.

LEG. NOWICK:

That's over sixty?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Yes.

LEG. CRECCA:

What's the difference between the two figures, the 9.4 and the 18?

MS. PORTA:

18 percent of the people in the Town of Smithtown are over the age of sixty. Of the two hundred and twenty-five thousand seniors in all of Suffolk County, Smithtown's is nine percent of the entire County.

LEG. CRECCA:

Okay. I got you.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

The highest concentration of those over sixty, they're on the east -- on the east end, Southold -- is it Southold? Southampton. Southold has twenty-eight percent, twenty-eight percent of their population is over the age of sixty. I mean they have a higher concentration than Florida, I mean it's huge. Shelter Island, I mean you talk about minute numbers, though, in Shelter Island they have thirty-four percent are over age sixty. So, you know, it's interesting looking at the different numbers.

11

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

Yes, it is.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

It depends. You're talking about small numbers, though, out on the east end, but they still, the concentration is very high. When you look at the numbers, it's kind of fun sometimes.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

Trying to figure out how one blends into the other. I was reading the other day a report about ambulance response time, and the east end really had the best numbers, you know, if you took it as a region across the County.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

But what about the number of calls?

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

Well, yeah, but with that number of seniors, they probably have a lot of calls.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

I had a conversation with somebody from an ambulance company a couple of years ago and he was frustrated because he said what makes him crazy is all the senior housing, you know, the senior housing is going up all over the place. And he said they don't take into account when they build these things, you know, maybe the hallways should be wider so you can get a gurney up or, you know, like they don't build for seniors in terms of emergencies.

And he said their calls have skyrocketed when the new senior housing

comes into the District. He said it's very frustrating, because he said, you know, you lose time when you have to get, you know, people in and out quickly and then they're not built that way.

And I never thought of that, you know, when we think of the senior housing, you don't think about the fact that you might have to bring gurneys in and out quickly to get people downstairs and things.

LEG. NOWICK:

These numbers also include -- we have a lot of nursing homes in Smithtown too, and those are residents, right?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

I think they would be listed as a resident.

LEG. NOWICK:

I think so.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

That's their permanent address at that point.

MS. PORTA:

We have sixty-two nursing homes in Suffolk County.

12

LEG. NOWICK:

How many?

MS. PORTA:

Sixty-two.

LEG. NOWICK:

Sixty-two nursing homes. That's why the beds are empty nowadays.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

Legislator Alden, you wanted to say something?

LEG. ALDEN:

For Budget Review, have you analyzed 2219-02? My question would be, this is going to amend the 2002 budget, create four positions, so can we do that right now?

MR. CLANCY:

What --

LEG. ALDEN:

There's four times a year we can amend the budget.

MR. CLANCY:

Correct. No. The fiscal impact that was provided by the County Executive's Budget Office stated that there was no fiscal impact, although we believe that, because it's providing the additional funding, that it's going to have at least a positive fiscal impact, but the funds weren't going to be offset.

The 2219, the funds were supposed to go towards contracted services according to the --

LEG. ALDEN:

Holly said that one of those has -- they create four positions.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

2219 creates four positions.

LEG. ALDEN:

2219 creates four positions. So, that's going to have some kind of impact on the budget and it's only seventy-five percent reimbursable.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

But the rest of it -- we're not asking for any additional County dollars, we're using indirect costs in the operating budget to do the match along with match we have from some of our home care. So, there is no -- we're not asking for additional dollars, we're not increasing taxes in any shape, way or form on that.

LEG. ALDEN:

But if we hired four people, there's an impact as far as, you know, New York State Retirement System and medical costs and things, you know, health costs and things like that. So, if there's four people --

13

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

It's paid out of the funding that we have.

LEG. ALDEN:

So all the retirement costs and everything else are --

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Employee benefits are listed in the resolution.

LEG. ALDEN:

All right. I don't have the resolution in front of me.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Oh, you don't have the resolution, I'm sorry.

LEG. ALDEN:

I just have the agenda.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

Do you want to see the resolution?

LEG. ALDEN:

Not yet.

MR. CLANCY:

Do you want the resolution? The resolution -- sorry. The resolution includes for 8330, social security twenty four ninety-seven out of the funds that are included go towards social security. One thousand thirty goes towards Welfare Fund contribution and then the total employee -- I'm sorry -- and then EO-39, the interfund transfer to employee benefits was seventy-six zero nine, which was the remaining funds. So they had the salaries of thirty-two thousand six thirty-three.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

That's because it's the end of the year.

MR. CLANCY:

It's only going to be for I think like two pay periods.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

It's not going to be much.

MR. CLANCY:

And then the contract agency, the contracted expenditures were 1-0-5-0-0-7, and retirement was two hundred and fifty thousand.

LEG. ALDEN:

Okay. So even if it's neutral, though, it's bringing up all those accounts, so it's a change in the budget.

MR. CLANCY:

For 2003, correct.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

Counsel is here, you wanted to ask that question about the cap laws.

14

LEG. ALDEN:

Hi, Paul.

MR. SABATINO:

Hi, Legislator Alden. I think there were two questions that were referred to me by the Chairman. The first one was whether or not there would be another resolution to create the positions. But, no, this is the first resolution I looked at that actually creates the positions simultaneously, which is the proper way to do it.

The second question was with regard to the caps. Robert is here, I believe the way the model is set up is that the cap -- is that funding from grants that occurs in its first year is treated as a calculation for cap law purposes, but that once it's in the budget on a continuing basis, that if it's a State or federal grant, then it doesn't become the calculations. I think these are continuations of pre-existing grants, but I don't think it will impact the cap. Robert's got the model and I will just defer to him on that part of it.

MR. LIPP:

I'm not sure exactly which appropriations have to look at them, but the way it does work is the first year that it appears in the adopted operating budget as grant money, it's omitted from the caps, it's not an issue, because it would be a burden accepting grant money if we did that. But since it's not, it doesn't meet the straight definition of caps, like it's not a mandate.

Then in the second year that it would be in the adopted budget, it would be considered discretionary, but which often isn't a problem, because, for instance, let's say a million dollar grant is an example and if it continues a million dollars in the second year, there's no change, so it doesn't create a burden for the caps.

LEG. ALDEN:

What year is this, the original year for this would be '02 or is this a continuation of something?

MR. LIPP:

I'm not sure.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

These grants are all continuations, but it's increased funds that we're asking to bring into the budget. We've receive additional funds this year.

MR. LIPP:

I'm not sure which particular --

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

All of them are increased funds.

MR. LIPP:

Were they in the adopted budget?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

But what we're asking for is that we have more -- we received a

notification grant award that has given us more money in each of these programs, because of the population increase.

MR. LIPP:

I'd have to double-check, I'm not a hundred percent sure.

LEG. ALDEN:

And, Robert, as long as you're here, we're creating four new positions, how does that affect cap laws? Because we've got -- how?

MR. LIPP:

Well, the physical positions aren't the issue, it's the expenditures themselves.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Which this funding will cover.

MR. LIPP:

Right. So what would happen is it would -- the funding -- to the extent that the funding covers it in the future, it doesn't affect the tax levy cap at all.

LEG. ALDEN:

Okay.

MR. LIPP:

But it still will affect the expenditure cap, the increase.

LEG. ALDEN:

So next year this is going to increase the expenditure cap?

MR. LIPP:

Yeah. The way it would work, for instance, let's say there was a million dollars in the budget arguably that was adopted and now it's going to go up to let's say two million dollars as an example for next year. There would be an additional discretionary expenditure of a million dollars that would have to work against the cap along with all the other pluses and minuses in the budget.

LEG. ALDEN:

It does affect the cap for next year, that's what I'm hearing.

MR. LIPP:

Yes.

LEG. ALDEN:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

How does it affect the cap, though, if the funding is reoccurring? It's

added -- an additional five hundred and fifty thousand dollars is added, it doesn't count this year, and then you said if the funding is reoccurring, it isn't tolled against the cap.

MR. LIPP:

The way the cap laws work is it compares the -- for instance, with this

16

year's budget, we compared -- when the County Executive brought over his recommended budget, we compared 2002 adopted expenditures to 2003 recommended expenditures, and everything that was considered, that fell under the category of discretionary expenditures was looked at and effectively as long as the recommended discretionary expenses did not increase by above four percent, then it would meet the cap law.

If it increased above that, then it would bump up against the cap law, because it would require a fourteen vote resolution. As a matter of fact, one of the issues in the recommended budget was the day care expense, which pushed the budget over, so that was not included in the recommended budget and the Legislature had to do a fourteen vote resolution in order to accept it.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

I understand the reason for the cap laws, but, I don't know, maybe somebody should take a look at it. If it hinders us accepting money from the Federal Government or the State Government, then we're doing something wrong.

MR. LIPP:

Well, I guess now is not a time for a lengthy discussion, but if you'd like me to brief you on the pros and cons on the cap laws, I'm more than willing to do it at any time.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

Are we okay now?

LEG. CRECCA:

Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:

Just on a different subject, and hopefully we can get this money. I don't know a lot about the heating, is it the HEAP Program?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

HEAP Program.

LEG. NOWICK:

Can you explain a little bit about where that's at and who -- what are the guidelines on the HEAP?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

We don't have the income guidelines with us on that. Generally what happens is those over the age of sixty, they are referred to our office for HEAP while everyone else goes to DSS, because we're almost a subcontractor to DSS's HEAP Program and we work with those over age sixty. And there are income guidelines. I don't have any of that information with me, but I can send that to me.

LEG. NOWICK:

I would be curious to what the guidelines are.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

I can send that to you. The HEAP Program has started. They're processing applications. And one of the things with HEAP that is

17

important to know is that when the money runs out, the program closes. So sometimes that happens in March, sometimes it never runs out and sometimes it closes even earlier.

LEG. NOWICK:

This is from the Federal Government?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:

A hundred percent funded?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:

How much do they give you a year on that?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

When the money is out, it's out, you know, the allocations are gone, they're gone. And again, it depends on, you know, how cold a winter it is, sometimes it goes --

LEG. NOWICK:

So this is brand new and it has the money?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

HEAP? Oh, no, HEAP's not new at all. It's just that they close their --

LEG. NOWICK:

So each of the applications were just starting?

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Yeah. They open up the heating season in September, this year was September, October, and then it closes again. That's what I'm saying, they close the program at a certain time and then they don't open it again until the following fall.

LEG. NOWICK:

Okay.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

It's not year round.

LEG. NOWICK:

So they close it and then it opens up right about now, because --

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Yes, because it's heating season. And just for your information too, emergency HEAP benefits have to be done through DSS, we do not do them in our office, even if it is for someone over the age of sixty.

LEG. NOWICK:

I would love the information on that and where we're at.

18

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Sure.

LEG. NOWICK:

And the threshold.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Okay. Does anybody else need that? I'll send it out.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

Yes. If you could send it to my office as well, I'd appreciate it.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

All right.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

Before we call up Art to see if he has anything, I was remiss before. I'd like the record to indicate that Legislator Haley has an excused absence this morning.

Art, do you have anything? Art, are you back there?

MR. LOZEAU:

I'm here.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

Thank you, Holly.

MS. RHODES-TEAGUE:

Sure.

MR. LOZEAU:

Art Lozeau, Director of Veterans Service Agency. The only comment I have is on this resolution of National Veterans Awareness Week. Just a couple of points, that I'm preparing some comments that are going to go up to the County Executive's Office, but I just want to share a couple of things with you.

Last October, the President declared Lessons of Liberty initiative, which was National Veterans Awareness Week. And I just think this resolution should fashion more that way, because the way I read this now, it doesn't give the County and its veterans organization, how to put it, enough credit for what they already do to remember veterans. So where we say something like for only two days, we should fashion this in a way that mirrors what the President declared, in that the Suffolk County residents in addition to what they already do from the various events to recognize ceremonies that they also declare this period National Veterans Awareness Week.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

Legislator Alden.

LEG. ALDEN:

Art, have you contacted Legislator Carpenter?

19

MR. LOZEAU:

No, I haven't.

LEG. ALDEN:

We can't amend this.

MR. LOZEAU:

Well --

LEG. ALDEN:

Only the sponsor can, and she's --

MR. LOZEAU:

Well, okay. Then I'll pass my comments up to the County Executive and have him contact --

LEG. ALDEN:

Actually, what I'm saying is it might be very beneficial to just give her a call even right now, because she can amend this.

MR. LOZEAU:
Sure.

LEG. ALDEN:
And she's the one that can amend it.

MR. LOZEAU:
Yeah. All right. Well, that's all I have.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:
Thanks, Art. Do you want to go to the agenda?

INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS

2139-02. Designating "National Veterans Awareness Week".

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:
Okay. To the agenda. 2139. We have a motion to table?

LEG. CRECCA:
Motion to table, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:
I'll second.

LEG. CRECCA:
Just for the purpose of letting Art meet with the sponsor in trying to work out some details.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:
Okay. Will you reach out for Legislator Carpenter, Art?

MR. LOZEAU:
Sure, absolutely

20

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:
Thank you. All in favor of tabling? (VOTE: 4-0-0-1) (ABSENT: HALEY)
TABLED

2200-02. Accepting and appropriating 75% reimbursable supplemental funds for the Title III-E New York Elder Caregiver Support Program.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:
2200. Accepting and appropriating 75% reimbursable supplemental funds for the Title III-E New York Elderly Caregiver Support Program. Do I

have a motion?

LEG. CRECCA:
Motion.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:
Second. All in favor? (VOTE: 4-0-0-1) (ABSENT: HALEY) APPROVED

2219-02. Accepting and appropriating 75% reimbursable supplemental funds for the Expanded-In-Home Service for the Elderly Program.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:
2219. Again accepting and appropriating property operating 75% reimbursable funds for the Elderly Program. Motion by Legislator Nowick.

LEG. CRECCA:
Second.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:
All in favor? (VOTE: 4-0-0-1) (ABSENT: HALEY) APPROVED

2221-02. Accepting and appropriating 75% reimbursable supplemental funds for the Community Service for the Elderly Program.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:
2221. Accepting and appropriating 75% reimbursable Community Service for Elderly Program. Motion?

LEG. CRECCA:
Motion.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:
All in favor? (VOTE: 4-0-0-1) (ABSENT: HALEY) APPROVED

2222-02. Accepting and appropriating additional 100% reimbursable funds for the State Long Term Care Ombudsman Program.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:
2222. Again accepting, this is a hundred percent reimbursable funds for the State Long Term Care Ombudsman Program. I'll make the motion.

LEG. CRECCA:
Second.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:
All in favor? (VOTE: 4-0-0-1) (ABSENT: HALEY) APPROVED

2223-02. Accepting and appropriating 75% reimbursable supplemental funds for the Congregate Services Initiative Program.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

2223. Again accepting and appropriating 75% reimbursable for Congregate Service Initiative Program. Motion by Legislator Nowick. All in favor?

(VOTE: 4-0-0-1) (ABSENT: HALEY) APPROVED

2224-02. Accepting and appropriating additional 100% reimbursable funds for the IIIC-2 Program.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

And 2224. Accepting and appropriating additional 100% reimbursable funds for the IIIC-2 Program.

LEG. ALDEN:

Motion.

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

Legislator Alden makes a motion, I'll second it. All in favor?

(VOTE: 4-0-0-1) (ABSENT: HALEY) APPROVED

CHAIRMAN LINDSAY:

Is there anything else? Anybody else want to address the Committee, any other business before the Committee? If not, we stand adjourned.

(THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 11:17 A.M.)